То:		PCT			
see form PCT/ISA/22	D	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)			
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below			
International application No. PCT/CH2004/000529	International filing date (c	(day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 02.09.2003			
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61L9/12, A01M1/20					
Applicant GIVAUDAN SA					
Box No. I Basis of th Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-estab Box No. IV Lack of un Box No. V Reasoned applicabilit Box No. VI Certain do Box No. VII Certain de Box No. VIII Certain ob FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international written opinion of the International written opinion of the International Bureau under F will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided submit to the IPEA a written months from the date of mai whichever expires later. For further options, see Form	Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.				
3. For further details, see notes	to Form PCT/ISA/220.				

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx; 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Marti, P

Authorized Officer



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

10/569885 International application No. PCT/CH2004/000529

IAP20	Rec'd	PETATO	9 6	CCD	2006
** ## 652 A	HOU G	Will I W	60	LEB	4000

		THE THE STATE OF THE COUNTY OF				
_	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion				
1.	. With regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international applicatio the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	la	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following guage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search older Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
a. type of material:						
		a sequence listing				
		table(s) related to the sequence listing				
b. format of material:						
	in written format					
		in computer readable form				
c. time of filing/furnishing:						
		contained in the international application as filed.				
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.	ha co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto is been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional poies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.				
1	Additional comments:					

	Box	k No. II	Priority			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1.	☐ The following document has not been furnished:									
	☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).									
		☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(b)).							(b)).	
			nsequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has ertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.							
2.		This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.								
3.	Add	litional c	observations, if nece	essary:						
		k No. V ustrial a	Reasoned states applicability; citation	ment und ons and e	er Rule 43 explanation	B <i>bis.</i> 1(a)(i) ns support	with regard to ting such state	novelty, inv ement	entive step o	or
1.	Sta	tement								
	Nov	elty (N)		Yes:	Claims	2-6				
	, ()		No:	Claims	1					
	Inventive step (IS)		Yes:	Claims	2-6					
			No:	Claims	1					
	Indu	ustrial a	pplicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-6				
2.	Cite	ations ar	nd explanations							
	see	separa	ate sheet							
	Box	k No. VI	II Certain observ	ations or	the inter	national ap	plication			

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: FR-A-2 522 270 D2: FR-A-2 635 955

D3: US 2002/136542 A1

2.1 Document D1 discloses an apparatus adapted to disseminate volatile liquid into an atmosphere (= dispositif pour la diffusion atmosphrérique d'un produit). The apparatus comprises a reservoir (1) containing the volatile liquid (13), a cylindrical transfer member (= mèche, 11) and an evaporating surface (= disques évaporateur, 9) comprising a rigid sheet extending laterally from the transfer member, wherein the transfer member passes through the evaporating surface by means of a hole (see the figures) and transfers liquid from the reservoir to the evaporating surface. Even if D1 does not explicitly mention that the transfer member should be elastically compressible in diameter, from the figures the impression is gained that it is a soft wicking element. Moreover, the apparatus further comprises a support member (10) for keeping the evaporating surfaces in a fixed position to the wick.

Note that D1 does not mention that prior to putting into service of the apparatus, the transfer member should be held in a compressed form of diameter smaller than that of the hole, and of release of compression expandable into liquid transfer contact with the evaporating surface. However, this is a functional feature derived from the use of the apparatus itself and it is not suitable to limit the scope of the claim.

Therefore, the subject-matter of claim can be read from D1 (Art. 33.2 PCT).

2.2 As already stated in point 2.1 above, D1 does not disclose that the transfer member should be supplied in compressed form and that in putting the apparatus into service, the compression of the transfer member should be released.

Therefore, the subject-matter of the method claim 6 is novel over D1 (Art. 33.2)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

10/569885 International application No.

PCT/CH2004/000529

IAP20 Rec'd PCT/FTO 28 FEB 2006

PCT).

- 2.3 Note that if claim 1 would make clear that the apparatus further comprises a rigid cylindrical member to held the transfer member in compressed form prior to using it, then the subject-matter of a correspondingly amended claim 1 would be novel over D1.
- 3.1 The International application PCT/CH 2004/000102, cited in the application and having the publication number WO 2004/082726 (published after the filing date of the present application), is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of the claims. Claim 6 solves the problem of securing the necessary liquid transfer contact between transfer member and evaporating surface avoiding the need of an exact fitting.
- 3.2 In D1 this problem does not exist, since transfer member and evaporating surface are delivered to the user already in "liquid contact".
- 3.2 Document D2 discloses an apparatus to disseminate a volatile liquid into the atmosphere (= diffuseur, 1). The apparatus comprises a reservoir (2) containing a volatile (but odourless liquid), a transfer member (= mèche, 4), and an evaporating surface (= matériau absorbant, 5) comprising a sheet. However, the transfer member does not pass through the evaporating surface by means of a hole. Furthermore, the apparatus is delivered with a cap (14) which is removed prior to using it.
- 3.3 D3 relates to the fastening of a fluid transport mechanism to a fluid reservoir to increase the effectiveness of the vaporisation units. The transfer member is elastically compressible in diameter, with a diameter in its non-compressed form greater than that of the hole. However, D3 does not disclose an evaporating surface and, consequently, the attachment of the transfer member to the evaporating surface.
- 3.4 None of the remaining cited prior art documents provides any indication or suggestion to arrive at the proposed solution.

Therefore, the subject-matter of claim 6 involves an inventive step (Art. 33.3 PCT).

PCT/CH2004/000529

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

1. Some of the features in the apparatus claim 1 relate to a method of using the apparatus rather than clearly defining the apparatus in terms of its technical features. The intended limitations are therefore not clear from this claim, contrary to the requirements of Article 6 PCT. See also Re Item V, point 2.1.